

ED 327 078

HE 024 091

AUTHOR Ruthven, A. Jan
TITLE Follow-up Study of Doctoral Program Graduates and Their Employers.
INSTITUTION Mississippi State Univ., Mississippi State.
PUB DATE Nov 90
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, November 14-16, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Doctoral Dissertations; *Doctoral Programs; *Educational Quality; Employer Attitudes; Followup Studies; *Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; Institutional Evaluation; Needs Assessment; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Mississippi State University

ABSTRACT

In accordance with Standard II.B of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education concerning the maintenance of relationships with graduates of professional education programs, this study surveyed all graduates (N=86) of doctoral-level programs in the College of Education at Mississippi State University from 1986 through 1989. The two-part questionnaire used in the study included demographic questions and open-ended evaluative questions as well as structured-response items grouped into six sections concerning: (1) quality of the graduate faculty; (2) relevance of selected courses; (3) preparation for scholarly work, teaching, and/or research; (4) preparation for present position; (5) the dissertation phase of the program; and (6) miscellaneous aspects of the program. In addition, each graduate was asked to have his/her employer/supervisor complete a brief rating of the graduate's on-the-job performance and return it to the university. Seventy-nine graduates responded to the survey. Employers indicated that the graduates were well prepared for the positions for which they were employed. The strength of the program most frequently identified by students was the quality of the relationships between students and professors. Weaknesses of the program included lack of an internship or applied experience and uncertainty as to whether the program would meet licensure requirements; also mentioned was lack of opportunities for involvement in research activities. Program modifications that have occurred include the addition of a Doctor of Philosophy in Education degree program and of five new courses in the Department of Educational Psychology. The questionnaire is appended. (DB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED322078

Follow-up Study of Doctoral
Program Graduates and Their Employers

A. Jan Ruthven

Mississippi State University

P.O. Box 5365
Mississippi State, MS 39762

Running Head: FOLLOW-UP STUDY

Paper presented at the 1990 Annual Meeting
of the Mid-South Educational Research Association
New Orleans, Louisiana
November 14-16, 1990

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A Jan Ruthven

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

* Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

HE 024 091

Abstract

NCATE requires that institutions seeking accreditation conduct periodic follow-ups of program graduates and their employers. Therefore, all graduates ($N = 86$) of doctoral-level programs in the College of Education at Mississippi State University from the Spring of 1986 through the Spring of 1989 were requested to participate in a follow-up study. Graduates were sent a two-part questionnaire. Part I included demographic questions and open-ended evaluative questions; Part II consisted of 75 structured-response items grouped into six sections: quality of the graduate faculty; relevance of selected courses; preparation for scholarly work, teaching, and/or research; preparation for present position; the dissertation phase of the program; and miscellaneous aspects of the program of study. In addition, the graduates were requested to have their employer/supervisor complete a brief rating of on-the-job performance and return it to MSU. Seventy-nine (92%) of the graduates responded to the questionnaire. Specific strengths and weaknesses of the programs were identified, along with employment settings. Employers indicated that the graduates were well-prepared for the positions for which they were employed. Program modifications and other activities that have resulted from the feedback received are summarized.

Follow-up Study of Doctoral Program Graduates and Their Employers

Introduction

Standard II.B of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) concerns Relationships with Graduates. The standard reads: "The unit maintains relationships with graduates from its professional education programs that include follow-up studies and assistance to beginning professionals" (NCATE, 1990, p. 50). Follow-ups of graduates are also required as part of Precondition 4--"The unit regularly monitors and evaluates, both internally and externally, its operation, scope, quality of its offerings, and effectiveness of its graduates" (NCATE, 1990, p. 30). Supporting documents required for Precondition 4 include "Summary of the findings of evaluation report(s) completed in last three years documenting external program review, including follow-up study of graduates and employers . . ." (NCATE, 1990, p. 30). During the last 3 years, Mississippi State University has conducted three unit-wide follow-up studies of graduates of advanced programs. Each of the three studies dealt with graduates from a different degree level; i.e., master's level, educational specialist level, and doctoral level. The purpose of this paper is to describe the follow-up study of graduates of the doctoral programs in the College of Education.

Method and Procedures

Addresses of the 86 graduates of doctoral-level programs in the College of Education from the Spring of 1986 through the Spring of 1989 were obtained from the departmental graduate coordinators. Each graduate was sent a packet containing the following: a letter requesting their participation in the follow-up study (see Appendix A), a questionnaire

entitled Doctoral Alumni of the College of Education Questionnaire (see Appendix B) or Doctoral Alumni of the Department of Educational Psychology Questionnaire (see Appendix C), a machine-scorable answer sheet, an Employer/Supervisor Rating of On-the-Job Performance (see Appendix D), and two stamped, addressed envelopes.

Data-Gathering Instruments

The questionnaires were adapted from a questionnaire developed for the Mississippi Board of Trustees for Institutions of Higher Learning by the deans of graduate schools in Mississippi universities. The questionnaire was originally developed for a comprehensive Doctoral Program Review conducted by the Board of Trustees in 1985-86. The adapted version of the questionnaires consists of two parts. Part I includes questions about current mailing address, employer/supervisor, and open-ended questions about suggestions for improvement, the greatest strength(s) of the program, and the greatest weakness(es) of the program (see Appendices B and C). Part II consists of 75 structured-response items; the graduate was asked to respond to each item using either a 3- or 4-point Likert-type scale (see Appendices B and C). The 75 items are grouped into six sections; the sections deal with: (a) the graduate faculty in the graduate's area of program emphasis; (b) general aspects of the doctoral program (which included the relevance of selected courses from the graduate's area of program emphasis and relevance of core courses (courses required of all doctoral students, regardless of area of emphasis)); (c) how well the program prepared the graduate for work in scholarly research, college teaching, and/or professional practice; (d) the dissertation phase of the program; (e) usefulness of various aspects of the program as preparation

for current position; (f) miscellaneous statements (dealing with such topics as library collections, facilities and equipment, reading of dissertation by various Deans, etc.). Responses for Part II were to be recorded on the machine-scorable answer sheet.

In addition to responding to the questionnaire, graduates were requested to have their employer/supervisor complete the **Employer/Supervisor Rating of On-the-Job Performance** and return it in one of the stamped, addressed envelopes. The employer was asked to indicate which of five statements most accurately described the graduate's performance on the job and to make additional comments about the graduate's academic preparation (see Appendix D).

Data Analysis

Mean ratings were calculated for each of the structured-response items; frequencies for qualitative responses were calculated and ranked. Via the mean ratings and frequencies, specific strengths and weaknesses of the programs were identified.

Results and Discussion

The findings were reported separately for graduates ($N = 66$) from the Doctor of Education degree program (with program emphases in Agricultural and Extension Education, Counselor Education, Educational Leadership, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and Vocational Education) and from the Doctor of Philosophy degree program in Educational Psychology ($N = 20$).

Summary of the Findings for the Ed.D. Follow-up

Sixty of the 66 graduates of the Ed.D. program from Spring of 1986 through the Spring of 1989 responded to the questionnaire. Almost half of

the graduates (45%) who responded were employed in post-secondary settings, with another 37% employed in K-12 settings. Overall, the graduates indicated that they felt that their doctoral program/experiences had prepared them well for their chosen careers. Employers/supervisors of the graduates agreed that the graduates were well-prepared for the positions in which they were employed.

Numerous strengths of the program were identified by the graduates. The most frequently mentioned strength of the program was the quality of the relationships between the students and their professors. Over half of the respondents mentioned this aspect of the program as a strength. Graduates were especially impressed with the accessibility of faculty to students. Other aspects of the program receiving particularly high ratings were: clarity of degree requirements, agreement between requirements and program objectives, fairness of examinations, the course "Educational Research Design," and the experience of working on the dissertation.

On the open-ended part of the questionnaire, only a small number of graduates identified specific weaknesses/limitations of the program. Weaknesses identified (via relatively lower mean ratings) on the structured-response part of the questionnaire included: opportunities for involvement in research activities, opportunities for involvement in higher education teaching, opportunities for attendance/participation in meetings of professional associations, opportunities for practica/clinical/internship experiences, integration of multicultural considerations in courses/programs, integration of special education/exceptionality considerations in courses/programs, and procedures for selecting major professor and committee members.

The most frequent suggestion for improvement related to degree requirements and curriculum was to require more courses in the area of program emphasis and related areas. The most frequent suggestions for improvement related to the dissertation process were for more time to be given to students from each committee member and for more instruction on the mechanics of completing a dissertation.

Summary of the Findings for the Ph.D. Follow-up

Eighteen of the 20 graduates of the Ph.D. program in Educational Psychology responded to the questionnaire. The graduates were most often employed in post-secondary institutions or in mental health agencies. In general the graduates of the program indicated that their doctoral program/experiences had prepared them adequately for their respective careers. Employers/supervisors of these graduates agreed that the graduates had been well-prepared for the positions in which they were employed.

The quality of relationships with professors and staff was identified by these graduates as a strength of the program. The graduates were particularly impressed with the faculty's enthusiasm for the field and the overall quality of the teaching. Other strengths of the program identified via the mean ratings obtained were: fairness of the examinations, flexibility of the program requirements to meet individual needs, the course "Educational Research Design," the course "Advanced Educational and Psychological Statistics," and the course "Psychological Testing in Education and Related Settings."

Two weaknesses/limitations of the program were mentioned on the open-ended portion of the questionnaire. These were: the lack of an internship or applied experience and uncertainty about whether the program

would meet requirements for licensure as a psychologist. The former weakness was usually mentioned by graduates who focused upon Industrial/Organizational Psychology as a major area of study; the latter weakness was expressed by graduates who focused upon Counseling as a major area of study. Other aspects of the program that received relatively lower mean ratings were: integration of multicultural considerations in courses/programs, opportunities for involvement in research activities, integration of dissertation research and course work, procedures for selecting the major professor and committee members, and library collections in program of study.

Regarding improvement in degree requirements and curriculum, the most frequent suggestion was to require an internship experience in all areas. Regarding improvement in the dissertation process, graduates suggested that committee members should devote more time to students' dissertations.

Discussion

Based upon the findings of the follow-up study and other considerations, several program modifications have occurred. One major change was the addition of a Doctor of Philosophy in Education degree program. The new Ph.D. program places greater emphasis upon research than the Ed.D. program. Internships are now required in Counselor Education, Educational Leadership, and the School Psychology program in Educational Psychology.

In the Department of Educational Psychology, five new courses have been added and others deleted from the school psychology curriculum. School psychology has achieved "program" rather than "concentration" status. The department also decided to discontinue three concentrations and to concentrate its resources on the school psychology program.

A greater emphasis is being placed upon multicultural considerations in courses/programs, specifically in the courses entitled "Psychological Foundations of Education," and "Interdisciplinary Seminar in Education." In addition, a professional development activity on multicultural education has been planned for faculty from each department.

Related to the identified need for more instruction on the dissertation process, the Office of the Graduate School has developed comprehensive Guidelines for Preparing Dissertations and Theses. Faculty members from the College of Education on the Graduate Council had considerable input regarding the development of these guidelines.

Graduates of the Ed.D. program indicated that there were limited opportunities for attendance/participation in meetings of professional associations. Several departments and the Dean's Office have increased their efforts to assist doctoral students with the expenses involved in attending professional meetings. Faculty members more frequently offer to share lodging and transportation with graduate students.

In addition to identifying areas for improvement or modification, follow-up evaluations such as this one serve to reinforce the strengths identified. For example, the College of Education requires that all doctoral students demonstrate mastery of research and statistical techniques via a Qualifying Examination. The committee responsible for developing the examinations has worked diligently to insure that the examinations are valid, fair, and objectively scored. To find that the graduates gave high ratings to "fairness with which Qualifying Examination (on research and statistics) was conducted and evaluated" reinforced the committee members for their efforts.

Implications for Others Conducting Follow-up Studies

The results of follow-up studies are obviously more meaningful for those directly involved in the programs being evaluated. However, it is possible that others preparing for NCATE accreditation may find the instrument used in this study of interest. The instrument was adapted to specifically reflect factors addressed in the NCATE standards/criteria. For example, "currency of knowledge of research findings/best practices in the field" (Item 6) and "scholarly contributions to the field" (Item 7) relate to the standards for faculty. Item 25--"integration of multicultural considerations in courses/programs," Item 26--"integration of special education/exceptionality considerations in courses/programs," and Item 27--"relations with related departments in the university" relate to the knowledge base standards. Item 69--"library collections were adequate for my program of study" and Item 70--"facilities and equipment in the department were adequate for my program of study" relate to the governance and resources standards.

Another interesting and useful aspect of the instrument is that it can easily be individualized for different program areas by substituting different courses for Items 28-44. However, individualizing the instrument in this manner will require careful coding of the answer sheets and may complicate the data analyses and reporting of results.

References

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1990).
Standards, procedures, and policies for the accreditation of professional
education units. Washington, DC: Author.

Appendix A

MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY

OFFICE OF GRADUATE EDUCATION

TEL.: (601) 325-3717
June 28, 1989

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

P. O. BOX 5365
MISSISSIPPI STATE, MISSISSIPPI 39762

Dear :

Our accreditation agency (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) requires that we periodically collect follow-up/evaluation data from our recent graduates and their employers.. This information that we are requesting is used to assist us in assessing the appropriateness of your doctoral training and what aspects of the curriculum need to be changed. This information will enable us to make changes that will help all future students.

Enclosed you will find a questionnaire entitled Doctoral Alumni of the College of Education Questionnaire. The questionnaire is comprised of two parts. Part I is presented in an open-ended format and should be answered in the spaces provided. If you should need additional space, please feel free to write on the back of the sheets provided. Part II is presented in a more structured, objective format and should be answered on the machine-scored answer sheet that is enclosed. There is no need for you to put your name on the machine-scored answer sheet. After completing the machine-scored answer sheet, please discard Part II and return only the completed answer sheet and Part I in the large, stamped envelope.

In addition, we would greatly appreciate your giving the one-page form entitled Employer/Supervisor Rating of On-the-Job Performance to your immediate supervisor (if applicable) and asking the supervisor to complete the form and return it in the standard, stamped envelope that has been provided.

Please complete the forms for us and return them as soon as possible. The views of each of our former students and their employers are important to us and we sincerely hope that you will assist us.

Sincerely,

Avis J. Ruthven
Director of Graduate Education

Enclosures (6)

Appendix B

DOCTORAL ALUMNI OF THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
QUESTIONNAIRE

Part I

Directions: Please complete the following in the space(s) provided.

Your Name: _____
(please print)

Current Mailing Address: _____

Please provide the following information about the position that you currently hold:

Position Title _____

Employing Agency _____
(name of university, agency, school district, etc.)

Name, Title, and Mailing Address of Your Immediate Supervisor:

(name)

(title)

(mailing address)

Please circle your area of program emphasis and area of specialization (if applicable) for the doctorate:

Agricultural and Extension Education

Agricultural Education

Extension Education

Elementary Education

Educational Administration & Supervision

School Administration

Community College Education/

Higher Education--Teaching

Community College Education/

Higher Education--Administration

Counselor Education

Community Counseling

Employee Development

Rehabilitation Counseling

School Counseling (Guidance)

Student Personnel/Student Development

Secondary Education

English

Mathematics

Social Studies/History

Science

Other _____

Vocational Education

Business Education

Vocational/Technical Education

Suggestions for improvements related to degree requirements and curriculum (e.g., require an additional statistics course): _____

Suggestions for improvements related to the dissertation process:

What was the greatest strength of your doctoral program/experience?

What was the greatest weakness/limitation of your doctoral program/experience? _____

Please provide any additional comments related to your doctoral experience at Mississippi State University that will be helpful to us as we develop and strive to improve our programs:

Please list any significant awards or recognition you have received since you received your doctorate:

Would you like to receive a periodic newsletter from the College of Education at Mississippi State University? Yes No
(please circle)

Thank you for your cooperation in completing the questionnaire. Please discard Part II of the questionnaire after completing the special answer sheet and return only the completed answer sheet and Part I of the questionnaire as soon as possible to Dr. Avis J. Ruthven, Director of Graduate Education, P.O. Box 5365, Mississippi State, MS 39762, in the enclosed stamped envelope.

(go on to next Part)

Part II of the Doctoral Alumni Questionnaire

Directions: For the following items (I-1 to VI-75) please give your opinion based on your best recollection of your doctoral education experience. Using the key provided at the right of each section, please blacken the appropriate space on the enclosed machine-scored answer sheet. Please use a No. 2 pencil. You do not need to put your name on the special answer sheet.

I. Overall, how would you rate the graduate faculty in your area of program emphasis?

	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
	↓	↓	↓	↓
1. Accessibility to students	1	2	3	4
2. Useful criticism of your work	1	2	3	4
3. Concern for your professional development	1	2	3	4
4. Guidance in the selection of courses	1	2	3	4
5. Helpfulness in dealing with classwork	1	2	3	4
6. Currency of knowledge of research findings/best practices in the field	1	2	3	4
7. Scholarly contributions to the field.	1	2	3	4
8. Enthusiasm for the field	1	2	3	4
9. Overall quality of teaching	1	2	3	4
10. Interest in graduate student's welfare, including their personal problems	1	2	3	4

II. How would you rate the following aspects of your doctoral program?

	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
	↓	↓	↓	↓
11. Clarity of stated requirements for the degree	1	2	3	4
12. Agreement between degree requirements and the stated objectives of the program	1	2	3	4
13. Logical structure or sequence of courses	1	2	3	4
14. Fairness with which Qualifying Examination (on research and statistics) was conducted and evaluated	1	2	3	4

- | | Excellent (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor (1) |
|---|---------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ |
| 15. Fairness with which Written Preliminary Examination was conducted and evaluated | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 16. Fairness with which Oral Preliminary Examination was conducted and evaluated | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 17. Flexibility of program requirements to meet individual needs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 18. Breadth of course and program offerings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 19. Depth of course and program offerings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 20. Opportunities for involvement in research activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 21. Opportunities for involvement in professional associations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 22. Opportunities for attendance/participation in meetings of professional associations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 23. Opportunities for involvement in higher education teaching | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 24. Opportunities for practica/clinical/internship experiences | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 25. Integration of multicultural considerations in courses/programs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 26. Integration of special education/exceptionality considerations in courses/programs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 27. Relations with related departments in the university | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Relevance of the following courses in area of program emphasis:
(rate only the courses that you took at MSU)

- | | Excellent (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor (1) |
|---|---------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ |
| 28. Public School Finance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 29. School Law | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 30. Public Relations in School Administration | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 31. School Survey and Plant | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

(go on to next page)

		Excellent (4)			
		Good (3)			
		Fair (2)			
		Poor (1)			
		↓	↓	↓	↓
32.	Advanced Supervision of Instruction	1	2	3	4
33.	Educational Leadership	1	2	3	4
34.	School Personnel Administration	1	2	3	4
35.	Applications of Theory to Educational Administration	1	2	3	4
36.	School Business Management	1	2	3	4
37.	Internship in Supervision and Supervision	1	2	3	4

Relevance/appropriateness of core courses:
(rate only the courses that you took at MSU)

38.	Function and Methods of Research in Education . . .	1	2	3	4
39.	Educational Research Design	1	2	3	4
40.	Educational and Psychological Statistics	1	2	3	4
41.	Advanced Educational and Psychological Statistics. .	1	2	3	4
42.	Psychological Foundations of Education	1	2	3	4
43.	Philosophy of Education	1	2	3	4
44.	Interdisciplinary Seminar in Education	1	2	3	4

III. Overall, how well do you think your program of study prepared you for work in each of the following areas?
(blacken one number for each item)

		not very <u>well</u>	fairly <u>well</u>	extremely <u>well</u>	not <u>applicable</u>
45.	Scholarly research	1	2	3	4
46.	College teaching	1	2	3	4
47.	Other professional practice (e.g., administrator, clinician, etc.)	1	2	3	4

(go on to next page)

- IV. Please evaluate the following components of the dissertation phase of your doctoral program according to the scale at the right.
(blacken one number for each item)

	Satisfactory as is (3)		
	Could be improved (2)		
	Needs substantial revision (1)		
	↓	↓	↓
48. Integration of dissertation research and course work	1	2	3
49. Procedures for selecting the major professor and committee members	1	2	3
50. Freedom of student to select own topic	1	2	3
51. Identification of a research topic during the early phase of the program of study was encouraged . .	1	2	3
52. Scope of research problem	1	2	3
53. Significance of the research problem	1	2	3
54. Formal and informal arrangements for student/faculty interaction	1	2	3
55. The nature of the supervisory relationship between chairperson, committee, and candidate	1	2	3
56. The nature and timing of the final oral examination	1	2	3
57. Quality of writing expected in the final document .	1	2	3
58. Degree of statistical expertise expected	1	2	3
59. Opportunity for the student's creative thinking and individual expression	1	2	3
60. Relevance of dissertation research to student's career plans	1	2	3

- V. As you look back to your graduate school years, and considering your present position, how valuable or useful were the following aspects of your graduate experience as preparation for your present work? (blacken one number for each item)

	Very great value (4)			
	Considerable value (3)			
	Some value (2)			
	Very little value (1)			
	↓	↓	↓	↓
61. Required courses in my area of program emphasis . .	1	2	3	4
62. Elective courses in my area of program emphasis . .	1	2	3	4
63. Required core courses outside area of emphasis . . .	1	2	3	4
64. Association with my major professor	1	2	3	4

(go on to next page)

- | | Very great value (4) | Considerable value (3) | Some value (2) | Very little value (1) |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ |
| 65. Association with other professors | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 66. Association with fellow graduate students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 67. Experience of working on my dissertation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 68. The college's standards of excellence for work in
my field | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

VI. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about your doctoral program?

- | | Agree strongly (4) | Agree with reservations (3) | Disagree with reservations (2) | Disagree strongly (1) |
|--|--------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ |
| 69. Library collections were adequate for my program of
study | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 70. Facilities and equipment in the department were
adequate for my program of study | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 71. I believe that the reading of all dissertations
by the Dean of the College of Education is
a good policy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 72. I believe that the reading of all dissertations
by the Dean of the Graduate School is a good
policy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 73. I consider the graduate program one of the best
in my field in the U.S. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 74. Among the peer groups in your profession, a
doctorate from MSU is regarded highly | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 75. I would advise a friend with similar interests to
study in this program | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Appendix C

DOCTORAL ALUMNI OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
PSYCHOLOGY QUESTIONNAIRE

Part I

Directions: Please complete the following in the space(s) provided.

Your Name: _____
(please print)

Current Mailing Address: _____

Please provide the following information about the position that you currently hold:

Position Title _____

Employing Agency _____
(name of university, agency, school district, etc.)

Name, Title, and Mailing Address, of Your Immediate Supervisor (or the person best able to evaluate your job performance); if self-employed, please give the name of your business:

_____	_____
(name)	(mailing address)
_____	_____
(title)	_____

Please circle your major area of study for the doctorate:

General/Teaching	Gifted	Industrial/Organizational Psychology
School Psychology	Counseling	Research and Evaluation

Did you complete a postdoctoral internship?
Yes No If yes, where? _____

Have you applied for licensure as a psychologist?
Yes No If yes, in what state? _____

If you did apply for licensure, did you receive it? Yes No

Suggestions for improvements related to degree requirements and curriculum (e.g., require an additional statistics course): _____

Suggestions for improvements related to the dissertation process:

What was the greatest strength of your doctoral program/experience?

What was the greatest weakness/limitation of your doctoral program/experience?

Please provide any additional comments related to your doctoral experience at Mississippi State University that will be helpful to us as we develop and strive to improve our programs:

Please list any significant awards or recognition you have received since you received your doctorate:

Would you like to receive a periodic newsletter from the College of Education (in addition to the Educational Psychology Newsletter)? Yes No
(please circle)

Thank you for your cooperation in completing the questionnaire. Please discard Part II of the questionnaire after completing the special answer sheet and return only the completed answer sheet and Part I of the questionnaire as soon as possible to Dr. Avis J. Ruthven, Director of Graduate Education, P.O. Box 5365, Mississippi State, MS 39762, in the enclosed stamped envelope.

(go on to next page)

Part II of the Doctoral Alumni Questionnaire

Directions: For the following items (I-1 to VI-75) please give your opinion based on your best recollection of your doctoral education experience. Using the key provided at the right of each section, please blacken the appropriate space on the enclosed machine-scored answer sheet. Please use a No. 2 pencil. You do not need to put your name on the special answer sheet.

I. How would you rate the graduate faculty of the Department of Educational Psychology?

- | | Excellent (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor (1) |
|---|---------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ |
| 1. Accessibility to students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Useful criticism of your work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Concern for your professional development | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Guidance in the selection of courses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Helpfulness in dealing with classwork | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Currency of knowledge of research findings/best practices in the field | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. Scholarly contributions to the field | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8. Enthusiasm for the field | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. Overall quality of teaching | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10. Interest in graduate student's welfare, including their personal problems | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

II. How would you rate the following aspects of your doctoral program?

- | | Excellent (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor (1) |
|---|---------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ |
| 11. Clarity of stated requirements for the degree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. Agreement between degree requirements and the stated objectives of the program | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 13. Logical structure or sequence of courses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14. Fairness with which Qualifying Examination (on research and statistics) was conducted and evaluated | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

(go on to next page)

- | | Excellent (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor (1) |
|---|---------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ |
| 15. Fairness with which Written Preliminary Examination was conducted and evaluated | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 16. Fairness with which Oral Preliminary Examination was conducted and evaluated | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 17. Flexibility of program requirements to meet individual needs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 18. Breadth of course and program offerings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 19. Depth of course and program offerings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 20. Opportunities for involvement in research activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 21. Opportunities for involvement in professional associations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 22. Opportunities for attendance/participation in meetings of professional associations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 23. Opportunities for involvement in higher education teaching | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 24. Opportunities for practica/clinical/internship experiences | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 25. Integration of multicultural considerations in courses/programs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 26. Integration of special education/exceptionality considerations in courses/programs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 27. Relations with related departments in the university | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Relevance of the following courses in major area of study:
(rate only the courses that you took at MSU)

- | | Excellent (4) | Good (3) | Fair (2) | Poor (1) |
|---|---------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ |
| 28. School Psychology | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 29. Physiological Psychology | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 30. Classroom Management and Discipline | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 31. Individual Assessment in Educational and Related Settings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

(go on to next page)

	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
	↓	↓	↓	↓
32. Abnormal Psychology	1	2	3	4
33. Interpretation of Intelligence/Psychometric Instruments	1	2	3	4
34. Projective Techniques in Educational and Related Settings	1	2	3	4
35. Advanced Child and Adolescent Psychology	1	2	3	4
36. Supervised Experiences in School Psychology	1	2	3	4
37. Social Psychology	1	2	3	4

Relevance/appropriateness of core courses:

(rate only the courses that you took at MSU)

38. Systems and Theories of Psychology	1	2	3	4
39. Educational Research Design	1	2	3	4
40. Educational and Psychological Statistics	1	2	3	4
41. Advanced Educational and Psychological Statistics. . .	1	2	3	4
42. Psychological Testing in Educational and Related Settings	1	2	3	4
43. Philosophy of Education or Philosophy of Science . .	1	2	3	4
44. Applied Research Seminar	1	2	3	4

III. Overall, how well do you think your program of study prepared you for work in each of the following areas?

(blacken one number for each item)

	<u>not very</u> <u>well</u>	<u>fairly</u> <u>well</u>	<u>extremely</u> <u>well</u>	<u>not</u> <u>applicable</u>
45. Scholarly research	1	2	3	4
46. College teaching	1	2	3	4
47. Other professional practice	1	2	3	4

(go on to next page)

- IV. Please evaluate the following components of the dissertation phase of your doctoral program according to the scale at the right.
(blacken one number for each item)

	Satisfactory as is (3)		
	Could be improved (2)		
	Needs substantial revision (1)		
	↓	↓	↓
48. Integration of dissertation research and course work	1	2	3
49. Procedures for selecting the major professor and committee members	1	2	3
50. Freedom of student to select own topic	1	2	3
51. Identification of a research topic during the early phase of the program of study was encouraged . .	1	2	3
52. Scope of research problem	1	2	3
53. Significance of the research problem	1	2	3
54. Formal and informal arrangements for student/faculty interaction	1	2	3
55. The nature of the supervisory relationship between major professor, committee, and candidate . . .	1	2	3
56. The nature and timing of the final oral examination	1	2	3
57. Quality of writing expected in the final document .	1	2	3
58. Degree of statistical expertise expected	1	2	3
59. Opportunity for the student's creative thinking and individual expression	1	2	3
60. Relevance of dissertation research to student's career plans	1	2	3

- V. As you look back to your graduate school years, and considering your present position, how valuable or useful were the following aspects of your graduate experience as preparation for your present work? (blacken one number for each item)

	Very great value (4)			
	Considerable value (3)			
	Some value (2)			
	Very little value (1)			
	↓	↓	↓	↓
61. Required courses in major area of study	1	2	3	4
62. Elective courses in major area of study	1	2	3	4
63. Required core courses	1	2	3	4
64. Association with my major professor	1	2	3	4

Very great value (4)
 Considerable value (3)
 Some value (2)
 Very little value (1)

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ |
| 65. Association with other professors | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 66. Association with fellow graduate students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 67. Experience of working on my dissertation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 68. The department's standards of excellence for work in
my field | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

VI. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about your doctoral program?

Agree strongly (4)
 Agree with reservations (3)
 Disagree with reservations (2)
 Disagree strongly (1)

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ |
| 69. Library collections were adequate for my program of
study | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 70. Facilities and equipment in the department were
adequate for my program of study | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 71. I believe that the reading of all dissertations
by the Dean of the College of Education is
a good policy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 72. I believe that the reading of all dissertations
by the Dean of the Graduate School is a good
policy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 73. I consider the graduate program one of the best
in the field in the U.S. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 74. Among the peer groups in your profession, a
doctorate from MSU is regarded highly | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 75. I would advise a friend with similar interests to
study in this program | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Appendix D

EMPLOYER/SUPERVISOR RATING OF ON-THE-JOB PERFORMANCE

Directions: This brief rating form is being used to evaluate the on-the-job performance of doctoral graduates of the College of Education at Mississippi State University. Please rate the individual who gave you this form and is identified below by checking the (one) statement which most closely identifies the graduate's performance in the position held. After completing the rating form, please return it in the stamped envelope that has been given to you. Thank you for your cooperation.

Graduate's Name: _____

Program Area: _____

- _____ 1. I consider the person's performance to be among the very best when compared with doctoral graduates from other institutions.
- _____ 2. I consider the person's performance to be excellent when compared with doctoral graduates from other institutions.
- _____ 3. I consider the person's performance to be average when compared with doctoral graduates from other institutions.
- _____ 4. I consider the person's performance to be weak when compared with doctoral graduates from other institutions.
- _____ 5. I consider the person's performance to be unsatisfactory when compared with doctoral graduates from other institutions.

Please indicate below any comments you would care to make regarding this graduate's academic preparation for the position held.